

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 34242

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 387
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: March 4, 2008
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
EVAN WILLIAM THOMSON,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. Daniel B. Meehl, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year, for possession of methamphetamine, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

PER CURIAM

Evan William Thomson was convicted of possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code §§ 37-2732(c)(1), 18-2707(d). The district court imposed a unified four-year sentence with a two-year determinate term and placed Thomson on probation for three years. Subsequently, Thomson admitted to violating several terms of the probation, and the district court consequently revoked probation and retained jurisdiction for 180 days. At the end of the retained jurisdiction period the district court relinquished jurisdiction, reducing Thomson's sentence to a unified sentence of four years, with a minimum period of confinement of one year. Thomson appeals, contending that the sentence is excessive.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-

15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Thomson's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.